



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/668,170	09/24/2003	Nathaniel W. Diedrich	48-1002	1347
36163	7590	01/29/2007	EXAMINER	
PLUMSEA LAW GROUP, LLC 10411 MOTOR CITY DRIVE SUITE 320 BETHESDA, MD 20817			NGUYEN, TUAN HOANG	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2618	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/29/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/668,170	DIEDRICH ET AL.
	Examiner Tuan H. Nguyen	Art Unit 2618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2006.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 10/31/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to Applicant's remark on pages 6-9, Applicant argues that either Gehrke et al. (US PUB. 2002/0178003 hereinafter, "Gehrke") or Lekven et al. (U.S PAT. 6,289,226 hereinafter, "Lekven") reference cited by the Examiner does not teach a second format be applied to a non-telephone number. Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant argument. Applicant should refer to Lekven reference (col. 8 line 66 through col. 10 line 6) where as the Examiner interpreted a second format be applied to a non-telephone number. Lekven teaches that the user may edit the formatting characters using conventional text editing techniques. For example, the system may display the parsing format with the first formatting character highlighted using, by way of example, reverse video display. The user can edit the highlighted formatting character by activating the control key or move to a different formatting character (read on "second format") by activating an additional control key. If the user elects to edit the formatting character, the user can alter the contents of the display by activating the scroll keys to select a different formatting character from a predetermined list (col. 9 lines 47-57). Therefore, the teaching of the prior art references still read on.

Base on the above rational, it is believed that the claimed limitations are met by the references submitted and therefore, the rejection are maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3 and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gehrke et al. (US PUB. 2002/0178003 hereinafter, "Gehrke") in view of Lekven et al. (U.S PAT. 6,289,226 hereinafter, "Lekven") and further in view of Soo Sung Lee (Japan Publication number 2001-308970 hereinafter, "Soo").

Consider claim 1, Gehrke teaches a central unit for formatting and preparing numbers for display comprising: a microphone port adapted to receive information from a microphone (see fig. 2 page 7 [0046]); a display port adapted to interact with a display device (see fig. 3 page 7 [0021]); wherein the central unit receives microphone information from the microphone port and determines if the information includes numbers or words (see fig. 2 page 7 [0046]).

Gehrke does not explicitly show that if numbers are received, determines if the numbers include a telephone number or a non-telephone number; and if a telephone number is received, formats the telephone number using a predetermined telephone number format including at least one separation character.

In the same field of endeavor, Lekven teaches if numbers are received, determines if the numbers include a telephone number or a non-telephone number (col. 6 lines 10-23); and if a telephone number is received, formats the telephone number using a predetermined telephone number format including at least one separation character (col. 1 lines 52-60).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use, if numbers are received, determines if the numbers include a telephone number or a non-telephone number; and if a telephone number is received, formats the telephone number using a predetermined telephone number format including at least one separation character, as taught by Lekven, in order to provide visual user feedback in a wireless communication device.

Gehrke and Lekven, in combination, fails to teach the telephone number includes at least one word command to assist in formatting the telephone number.

However, Soo teaches the telephone number includes at least one word command to assist in formatting the telephone number (page 2 [0013]).

Therefore, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the disclosing of Soo into view of Gehrke and Lekven, in order to provide a speech recognition operation method for portable telephone by a speech instruction word.

Consider claim 2, Lekven further teaches a second format is used to format a non-telephone number (col. 8 line 66 through col. 9 line 20).

Consider claim 3, Lekven further teaches the central unit detects an actuation of a talk button and uses the actuation to insert a separation character (col. 6 lines 44-61).

Consider claim 8, Lekven further teaches the telephone number is formatted using a predetermined telephone number format and any pause is disregarded (col. 1 lines 52-60).

Consider claim 9, Lekven further teaches a second format is used to format a non-telephone number and the formatted number is sent to the display port.

4. Claims 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gehrke in view of Lekven and Soo, and further in view of Kuita (U.S PUB. 2003/0139171).

Consider claim 4, Gehrke, Lekven and Soo, in combination, fails to teaches the central unit detects at least one pause in the microphone information.

However, Kuita teaches the central unit detects at least one pause in the microphone information (page 2 [0032]).

Therefore, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the disclosing of Kuita into view of Gehrke Lekven and Soo, in order to provide a portable communication device which is capable of registering both a directory number and a mail address of the other party device once communication is carried out with the opposed party device.

Consider claim 5, Kuita further teaches the central unit inserts a separator character in a location corresponding to the pause (page 1 [0016]).

Consider claim 6, Kuita further teaches the pause is determined if a period of relative silence equals or exceeds a preset duration (page 1 [0016]).

Consider claims 7, Kuita further teaches the microphone information includes groups of numbers and pauses separating the groups of numbers (page 3 [0041]), and wherein the central unit converts the microphone information into a string of machine readable characters (page 2 [0033]), and wherein the central unit places a separation character in a location corresponding to a pause (page 1 [0016]).

5. Claims 10-11 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gehrke in view of Lekven.

Consider claim 10, Gehrke teaches a method of formatting and preparing numbers for display comprising the steps of: receiving microphone information from a microphone port (see fig. 2 page 7 [0046]); determining if the microphone information includes words or numbers (see fig. 2 page 7 [0046]); determining if the numbers include a telephone number (see fig. 2 page 7 [0046]).

Gehrke does not explicitly show that if the numbers include a telephone number, then formatting the number using a first format to produce a first formatted number; if the numbers do not include a telephone number, then formatting the number using a second format to produce a second formatted number; and wherein the first format is different than the second format.

In the same field of endeavor, Lekven teaches if the numbers include a telephone number, then formatting the number using a first format to produce a first formatted number (col. 6 lines 10-23); if the numbers do not include a telephone number, then formatting the number using a second format to produce a second formatted number (col. 8 line 66 through col. 9 line 20); and wherein the first format is different than the second format (col. 8 line 66 through col. 9 line 20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use, if the numbers include a telephone number, then formatting the number using a first format to produce a first formatted number; if the numbers do not include a telephone number, then formatting the number using a second format to produce a second formatted number; and wherein the first format is

different than the second format, as taught by Lekven, in order to provide visual user feedback in a wireless communication device.

Consider claim 11, Lekven further teaches the central unit detects an actuation of a talk button and uses the actuation to insert a separation character (col. 6 lines 44-61).

Consider claim 15, Lekven further teaches the telephone number is formatted using a predetermined telephone number format and any pause is disregarded (col. 1 lines 52-60).

6. Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gehrke in view of Lekven to claims above, and further in view of Kuita.

Consider claim 12, Gehrke and Lekven, in combination, fails to teach the central unit detects at least one pause in the microphone information.

However, Kuita teaches the central unit detects at least one pause in the microphone information (page 2 [0032]).

Therefore, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the disclosing of Kuita into view of Gehrke and Lekven, in order to provide a portable communication device which is capable of registering both a directory number and a mail address of the other party device once communication is carried out with the opposed party device.

Consider claim 13, Kuita further teaches the central unit inserts a separator character in a location corresponding to the pause (page 1 [0016]).

Consider claim 14, Kuita further teaches the microphone information includes groups of numbers and pauses separating the groups of numbers (page 3 [0041]), and wherein the central unit converts the microphone information into a string of machine readable characters (page 2 [0033]), and wherein the central unit places a separation character in a location corresponding to a pause (page 1 [0016]).

7. Claims 16-17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stulberger (US PUB. 2003/0064748) in view of Lekven.

Consider claim 16, Stulberger teaches a motor vehicle comprising: a chassis (see fig. 1 page 1 [0008]), at least one wheel adapted to contact a driving surface (see fig. 1 page 1 [0008]); an interior comprising a steering wheel, a dashboard and a driver's seat (see fig. 1 page 1 [0008]); a hands free telephone (HFT) system comprising a microphone disposed in a headliner, at least one HFT control disposed on the steering wheel, and a display (see fig. 1 page 6 [0118]).

Stulberger does not explicitly show that the HFT system receives a dictated string of information, formats the information and displays the information, and wherein the HFT system applies a first format to a first type of information and applies a second format to a second type of information.

In the same field of endeavor, Lekven teaches the HFT system receives a dictated string of information, formats the information and displays the information (col. 1 lines 29-39), and wherein the HFT system applies a first format to a first type of information and applies a second format to a second type of information (col. 1 lines 52-60 and col. 6 lines 10-23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use, if numbers are received, determines if the numbers include a telephone number or a non-telephone number; and if a telephone number is received, formats the telephone number using a predetermined telephone number format including at least one separation character, as taught by Lekven, in order to provide visual user feedback in a wireless communication device.

Consider claim 17, Lekven further teaches the first type of information is a telephone number (col. 1 lines 52-60).

Consider claim 20, Lekven further teaches the HFT system displays formatted information (col. 3 lines 30-36).

8. Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stulberger in view of Lekven to claim 16 above, and further in view of Kuita.

Consider claim 18, Stulberger and Lekven, in combination, fails to teach the HFT system is capable of detecting pauses in the string of information.

However, Kuita teaches the HFT system is capable of detecting pauses in the string of information (page 2 [0033]).

Therefore, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the disclosing of Kuita into view of Stulberger and Lekven, in order to provide a portable communication device which is capable of registering both a directory number and a mail address of the other party device once communication is carried out with the opposed party device.

Consider claim 19, Kuita further teaches the HFT system uses a pause in the string of information for the second format (page 2 [0033]) and inserts a separation character in a location corresponding to the pause (page 2 [0020]).

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Mail Stop _____ (Explanation, e.g., Amendment or After-final, etc.)
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Facsimile responses should be faxed to:

(571) 273-8300

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22313

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan H. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571)272-8329. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00Am - 5:00Pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Maung Nay A. can be reached on (571)272-7882882. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2618

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)
273-8300.

Information Consider the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tuan Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2618


NAY MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER